arXiv:1404.2787v1 [stat.AP] 10 Apr 2014

Convergence and error propagation results on a linear iterative unfolding method

András László

Wigner RCP, P.O.Box 49, H-1525 Budapest, Hungary

E-mail: laszlo.andras@wigner.mta.hu

Abstract. Unfolding problems often arise in the context of signal processing, data analysis and experimental physics in general. It occurs when the probability distribution of a physical quantity is to be measured but it is randomized (smeared) by some well-described process, such as a non-ideal detector response or a well parametrized physical phenomenon. In such cases it is said that the original probability distribution of interest is folded by a known response function. The reconstruction of the original probability distribution from the measured one and from the response function is called unfolding, which is a delicate problem in signal or data processing. As the unfolding problem is numerically ill-posed, most methods have some relatively arbitrary control parameter on regularization. A large class of these methods, by construction, introduce bias which is difficult to quantify, furthermore sometimes it is difficult to show that the method is consistent, i.e. that the bias tends to zero with respect to the control parameters of the method. Quantification of statistical and systematic error of the unfolded distribution is often also an issue. We propose a linear iterative method for which we prove that the bias error converges to zero with increasing iteration order, i.e. the metod is consistent. In case of presence of statistical and systematic errors on the measured distribution or the response function, we prove explicit error propagation formulae. With this, an optimal iteration stopping criterion can be defined, and the three important error terms —the bias error, the statistical error and the systematic error— of the unfolded distribution can be directly quantified at the optimum.

PACS numbers: 02.30.Zz

Submitted to: *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*

Keywords: unfolding, deconvolution, iterative, convergence, error propagation

1. Introduction

In data analysis one commonly faces the problem that the probability density function (*pdf*) of a given physical quantity of interest is to be measured, but some random physical process, such as the intrinsic behavior of the measurement apparatus, smears it. The reconstruction of the pertinent unknown pdf of interest based on the observed smeared pdf and on the known response function of the measurement procedure is called unfolding.

Let $x \mapsto f(x)$ be the unknown pdf which we intend to reconstruct, $(y, x) \mapsto \rho(y|x)$ be the response function of the smearing effect, and we assume that $y \mapsto g(y) = \int \rho(y|x)\, f(x)\, \mathrm{d}x$ is the measured pdf after smearing. In practice, the measured g often contains an additional error term $y \mapsto e(y)$ originating from statistical counting and unaccounted systematic measurement distortions. The task of unfolding is to provide some close estimate for $x \mapsto f(x)$, given $y \mapsto g(y)$ and $(y, x) \mapsto \rho(y|x)$, i.e. to solve the above linear integral equation. This problem is numerically ill-posed as, according to Banach's closed graph theorem, a generic folding operator maps certain distant pdfs to close ones whose difference are shadowed by the contribution of the measurement error term [1, 2, 3, 4].

In order to overcome the ill-posedness of the unfolding problem, some methods use restrictions on the unknown pdf [1, 3, 4]. These restrictions are controled by some regularization parameters whose particular value brings in a certain degree of arbitraryness (bias error) to the unfolded pdf, which is often difficult to quantify. In case of a consistent method the bias error should converge to zero when the regularization parameter is relaxed. In case of a consistent iterative method, the regularization parameter is the iteration stopping order, and the bias error which depends on this must converge to zero with increasing number of iterations.

In a previous paper [1] we proposed a linear iterative unfolding method discussing its pros and cons in comparison to other techniques and providing detailed description from the practical point of view for experimentalists. In the present paper we provide formal mathematical proofs for the claims therein:

(i) proof of consistency, i.e. that the bias error converges to zero with increasing number of iterations,

(ii) explicit formula for the bias error at finitie iteration order,

(iii) error propagation formula for statistical errors on the measured pdf at finite iteration order,

(iv) error propagation formula for systematic errors on the measured pdf or response function at finite iteration order.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 the problem of unfolding is introduced in a mathematically rigorous way, and the basic properties of generic folding operators are discussed. In Section 3 our proposed method is introduced and proofs are provided for the above properties. In Section 4 we generalize a bit our results for the case of probability measures which are not described by pdfs. Finally, in Section 5 we summarize.

2. Mathematical properties of folding operators and the unfolding

In the text we shall abbraviate by *pdf* the notion of probability density function, by *cpdf* the notion of conditional probability density function. We shall rely on the usual

terminology in functional analysis and measure theory [8, 9]. As such, the notion of Lebesgue almost everywhere or Lebesgue almost every, shall be abbraviated by *a.e.*

Let X and Y be finite dimensional real vector spaces equipped with the Lebesgue measure — unique up to a global positive constant normalization factor. Let $L^1(X)$ and $L^1(Y)$ denote the Banach spaces of $X \to \mathbb{C}$ and $Y \to \mathbb{C}$ Lebesgue integrable function equivalence classes, respectively, where the equivalence of functions is defined by being a.e. equal. As usual in functional analysis texts, we shall call these function equivalence classes simply functions. We shall also use the notion of essential bound for such a function which is the smallest upper bound valid a.e.

Definition 1. *Let $\rho : Y \times X \to \mathbb{R}_0^+$, $(y, x) \mapsto \rho(y|x)$ be a cpdf over the product space $Y \times X$, i.e. a non-negative Lebesgue measurable function which satisfies $\forall x \in X : \int \rho(y|x)\,\mathrm{d}y = 1$. Then, the linear operator*

$$A_\rho \;:\; L^1(X) \to L^1(Y),\; (x \mapsto f(x)) \;\mapsto\; \left(y \mapsto \int \rho(y|x)\, f(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \right) \quad (1)$$

is called the folding operator by ρ, where the function ρ is called the response function of the folding.

Remark 2. *The following basic properties of folding operators are direct consequences of the definition.*

- *(i) A possible usual generalization of the notion of folding operator is when inefficiencies are also allowed, i.e. the less restrictive condition $\forall x \in X : \int \rho(y|x)\,\mathrm{d}y \leq 1$ is required for the response function ρ of the folding operator A_ρ. The results throughout the paper are also valid for that case.*
- *(ii) By Fubini's theorem, a folding is a well defined linear operator.*
- *(iii) It is also quite evident [2] that such operator is continuous in the L^1 operator norm (i.e. in probabilistic sense), moreover $\|A_\rho\|_{L^1(X)\to L^1(Y)} = 1$, while $\|A_\rho\|_{L^1(X)\to L^1(Y)} \leq 1$ whenever inefficiencies are allowed.*

It is seen that such a folding operator A_ρ is quite well behaved: it is linear and is continuous in the probabilistic sense, i.e. close pdfs are mapped to close pdfs [1] in the L^1, i.e. in the probabilistic sense.

A quite important class of folding operators are convolutions, in which case the shape of the response function is translationally invariant.

Definition 3. *A folding operator A_ρ is called convolution whenever the response function ρ is translationally invariant in the sense that $Y = X$ and $\forall x, y, z \in X : \rho(y|x + z) = \rho(y - z|x)$.*

Remark 4. *The following properties of convolution operators are well-known results [2, 5, 6].*

- *(i) In case when a folding operator A_ρ is a convolution, the response function ρ may be expressed by the single pdf $\eta := \rho(\cdot|0)$ in the form $\forall x, y \in X : \rho(y|x) = \eta(y-x)$. The alternative notation $\eta \star f := A_\rho f$ is often used in such case ($f \in L^1(X)$). Note that convolution is commutative, i.e. one has $\eta \star f = f \star \eta$ for all $\eta, f \in L^1(X)$.*
- *(ii) A convolution operator is not onto, and its image is not closed.*
- *(iii) The image of a convolution operator is dense if and only if the Fourier transform of the convolver function is nowhere zero (Wiener's approximation theorem).*

(iv) A convolution operator is one-to-one if and only if the Fourier transform of the convolver function is a.e. nonzero.

(v) Consequently, the inverse of a convolution operator, whenever exists, cannot be continuous. This is because a convolution is everywhere defined on the closed set $L^1(X)$, it is continuous, and therefore it has closed graph by Banach's closed graph theorem; but since the inverse operator's domain is not closed, again by Banach's closed graph theorem, it cannot be continuous.

Since the convolution operators form a quite large example class of folding operators, we can state that a generic folding operator's inverse, whenever exists, is not continuous. This finding is often referred to as: the inversion of a generic folding operator is ill-posed. The argument goes as follows: we have an unknown pdf f, a known response function ρ, and a measured pdf $g = A_\rho f + e$ where e represents a small measurement error term. Then, when one would set $A_\rho^{-1} g = f + A_\rho^{-1} e$, the error term e contains modes not in the domain of A_ρ^{-1} in which case $A_\rho^{-1} e$ is not meaningful, or when approximated numerically, this term shall diverge. Note that even if all modes of e were in the domain of A_ρ^{-1}, the smallness of $A_\rho^{-1} e$ is not guaranteed even though e is small. The ill-posedness of a generic unfolding problem may also be stated as: if f_1 and f_2 are distant pdfs, then $g_1 := A_\rho f_1 + e_1$ and $g_2 := A_\rho f_2 + e_2$ may be close pdfs, i.e. we lose discrimination power on pdfs after a folding [1]. The presented argument also warns us against relying solely on the so called *closure test* when verifying an unfolding algorithm: whenever some unfolding method gives some estimate $\hat{f}$ for the unknown pdf f, it is usually argued that $A_\rho \hat{f} \approx A_\rho f$ confirms the validity of the estimate $\hat{f}$. Clearly, in the light of our observations this is not enough, as $\hat{f}$ may be still far from f in the probabilistic distance.

Due to the ill-posedness of the unfolding problem, any unfolding method needs to use some kind of regularization: some assumption on the original (unknown) pdf, and a way to search for an approximative solution depending on some regularization parameters. Furthermore, the convergence to the original pdf when relaxig these parameters can usually be only achieved in some weak sense, not in the probabilistic norm of $L^1(X)$. The most commonly applied unfolding strategies are summarized in [1, 3, 4].

3. A linear iterative unfolding method

Since the folding equation Eq.(1) is linear, it is quite natural to try applying some iterative inversion methods known in functional analysis, when approximating the true solution f. One such self-suggesting method is Neumann series [8, 9] which guarantees that whenever for a continuous linear operator A over a Banach space one has $\|I - A\| < 1$ (I being the identity operator), then $A^{-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (I - A)^n$ where the convergence is in the operator norm. The convergence condition, however, cannot hold because for a generic folding operator one has $\|I - A_\rho\|_{L^1 \to L^1} = 2$ as shown in [2]. An other evident choice would be the Landweber iteration [7] known in the theory of Fredholm integral equations [8, 9]. This assumes, in first place, that the unknown function f and the result of the folding g resides in the space of square integrable functions $L^2(X)$, furthermore that the response function ρ satisfies the regularity condition $\int \int \left|\rho(y|x)\right|^2 \mathrm{d}y \, \mathrm{d}x < \infty$. The latter regularity condition, unfortunately, is violated in the case of a generic cpdf, on the contrary to the common belief in the

literature.‡

Despite of the fact that neither the Neumann series nor the Landweber iteration can be directly applied to an unfolding problem, they provide a possible starting point. Motivated by these algorithms we proposed a linear iterative unfolding method for a probability theory context [1].

In the followings we shall denote by $L^p(X)$ the Banach space of $X \to \mathbb{C}$ functions [8, 9] which are Lebesgue integrable of the p-th power ($1 \leq p \leq \infty$). The special case $L^\infty(X)$ for $p = \infty$ is defined as the Banach space of the $X \to \mathbb{C}$ essentially bounded functions with their norm being the essential bound.

Remark 5. *The argumentation in the followings relies on some known results.*

(i) The Riesz-Thorin theorem [10] states that if $1 \leq q \leq r \leq \infty$ and $F \subset L^q(X) \cap L^r(X)$ is a dense linear subspace in both $L^q(X)$ and $L^r(X)$, furthermore a linear operator $T : F \to L^q(X) \cap L^r(X)$ is bounded both in the $L^q(X)$ and $L^r(X)$ norm, then for all $q \leq p \leq r$ values $F \subset L^p(X)$, it is dense in $L^p(X)$, $T[F] \subset L^p(X)$ and T is bounded in the $L^p(X)$ norm. Thus, T is uniquely extendable as an $L^p(X) \to L^p(X)$ bounded linear operator. In addition we have that

$$\|T\|_{L^p \to L^p} \leq \max\left(\|T\|_{L^q \to L^q}, \|T\|_{L^r \to L^r}\right) \tag{2}$$

holds for the operator norms.

(ii) An important consequence of the Riesz-Thorin theorem is that a convolution operator $\eta\star(\cdot)$ by a function $\eta \in L^1(X)$ is well defined and continuous in $L^p(X)$ for all $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and its operator norm is bounded by $\|\eta\|_{L^1}$. This obviously holds for the $p = 1$ and $p = \infty$ case due to Hölder's inequality, and then it is implied for all $1 < p < \infty$ as well by the pertinent theorem. As a consequence, using the commutativity of convolution, it also follows that if $\varphi \in L^p(X)$ and $\eta \in L^1(X)$ then $\varphi \star \eta \in L^p(X)$, i.e. pdfs may be mapped into $L^p(X)$ via convolution by pdfs integrable on the p-th power.

(iii) We shall use in the followings the spectral representation [9] of normal operators over complex separable Hilbert spaces. Let T be a normal operator over the pertinent space, i.e. a densely defined linear operator with closed graph, satisfying $T^*T = TT^*$, $(\cdot)^*$ being the adjoint. Then there exists a unique projection valued measure P over the Borel sets of the spectrum set of T, $\mathrm{Sp}(T)$, such that

$$T = \int_{\lambda \in \mathrm{Sp}(T)} \lambda \, \mathrm{d}P(\lambda) \tag{3}$$

holds, where the integral is defined in the weak sense. That is, for all elements f, g in the Hilbert space one has a complex valued Borel measure $\langle f, P(\cdot)g\rangle$ such that

$$\langle f, Tg\rangle = \int_{\lambda \in \mathrm{Sp}(T)} \lambda \, \mathrm{d} \, \langle f, P(\lambda)g\rangle \, . \tag{4}$$

In addition, one has that if M is a polynomial, then $M(T)$ is also normal operator, furthermore

$$M(T) = \int_{\lambda \in \mathrm{Sp}(T)} M(\lambda) \, \mathrm{d}P(\lambda) \tag{5}$$

is satisfied in the same sense.

‡ It is evidently seen that this regularity condition does not hold for any convolution. It is also seen at the price of some calculation that this situation cannot be repaired by a compactification mapping, i.e. if we map the support set of our pdfs and response function into a compact region of Y and X.

Throughout the argumentation we will need the notion of transpose folding which is introduced below.

Definition 6. *If A_ρ is a folding operator such that the response function $\rho(\cdot|x)$ is square-integrable for all $x \in X$, then for all $k \in L^2(Y)$ the expression*

$$A_\rho^T k := \left(x \mapsto \int k(y)\, \rho(y|x)\, \mathrm{d}y \right) \tag{6}$$

is meaningful and defines a linear map from $L^2(Y)$ to the Lebesgue measurable functions $X \to \mathbb{C}$.

3.1. ***The iterative approximation***

Equipped with the listed notions, we can introduce the following approximating sequence for solution of the unfolding problem. Let $g = A_\rho f$ be our unfolding problem where f is to be determined, with g and ρ being known. We try to approximate the solution in the form:

$$\begin{aligned} K_\rho &:= \sup_{x \in X} \int\int \rho(y|z)\, \rho(y|x)\, \mathrm{d}y\, \mathrm{d}z, \\ f_0 &:= K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T g, \\ f_{N+1} &:= f_N + \left(f_0 - K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T A_\rho f_N \right) \\ &\quad (N \in \mathbb{N}_0). \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

3.2. ***Convergence conditions***

The following theorem shows that under quite generic conditions the approximating sequence $(f_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ in terms of Eq.(7) is well-defined and converges to f whenever A_ρ is one-to-one, and it converges to the closest possible function to f whenever A_ρ is not one-to-one.

Theorem 7. *(Convergence) Let A_ρ be a folding operator and assume that its response function ρ has the property that for all $x \in X$ the function $\rho(\cdot|x)$ is square-integrable, furthermore $K_\rho < \infty$. Assume that the unknown pdf f in the unfolding problem $g = A_\rho f$ is square-integrable. Then:*

(i) For any compact set $U \subset X$:

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{\mathrm{Volume}(U)} \int_{x \in U} \left(f - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)} f - f_N \right)(x)\, \mathrm{d}x = 0, \tag{8}$$

where $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}$ is the L^2 orthogonal projection onto the kernel set of A_ρ.

(ii) We have that

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \left\| f - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)} f - f_N \right\|_{L^2} = 0 \tag{9}$$

and the convergence is monotone.

Proof It is seen that whenever the regularity condition $\forall x \in X : \rho(\cdot|x) \in L^2(Y)$ holds, the function

$$\alpha : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}_0^+,\ (z, x) \mapsto \alpha(z, x) := \int \rho(y|z) \rho(y|x)\, \mathrm{d}y \tag{10}$$

is well defined. By construction, it is symmetric, i.e. $\forall z, x \in X : \alpha(z,x) = \alpha(x,z)$. Furthermore, because of $K_\rho < \infty$ and symmetricity,

$$\sup_{x\in X}\int_{z\in X}\alpha(z,x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \sup_{z\in X}\int_{x\in X}\alpha(z,x)\,\mathrm{d}x = K_\rho < \infty \tag{11}$$

holds. With this, we see that the operator $A_\rho^T A_\rho$ is well defined as $L^1(X) \to L^1(X)$ and is bounded, its $L^1 \to L^1$ operator norm being K_ρ. This is because for any $f \in L^1(X)$

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|A_\rho^T A_\rho f\right\|_{L^1} &= \int\left|\int \alpha(z,x)f(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\right|\,\mathrm{d}z \\ &\le \int\int \alpha(z,x)\,|f(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}z = \int\left(\int\alpha(z,x)\,\mathrm{d}z\right)|f(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\le \sup_{x\in X}\left(\int_{z\in X}\alpha(z,x)\,\mathrm{d}z\right)\int_{x\in X}|f(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x = K_\rho\left\|f\right\|_{L^1}\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

due to of monotonity of integration, Fubini's theorem and Hölder's inequality. It is also seen that the operator $A_\rho^T A_\rho$ is well defined as $L^\infty(X) \to L^\infty(X)$ and is bounded, its $L^\infty \to L^\infty$ operator norm being K_ρ. That is because for any $f \in L^\infty(X)$

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|A_\rho^T A_\rho f\right\|_{L^\infty} &= \sup_{z\in X}\left|\int\alpha(z,x)f(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \\ &\le \sup_{z\in X}\int\alpha(z,x)\,|f(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x \le \sup_{z\in X}\left(\int\alpha(z,x)\,\mathrm{d}x\sup_{x\in X}|f(x)|\right) \\ &= \sup_{z\in X}\left(\int_{x\in X}\alpha(z,x)\,\mathrm{d}x\right)\sup_{x\in X}|f(x)| = K_\rho\left\|f\right\|_{L^\infty}\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

due to monotonity of integration and Hölder's inequality.

Now, using Riesz-Thorin theorem we have that the operator $A_\rho^T A_\rho$ is well-defined as $L^2(X) \to L^2(X)$ and is bounded, its $L^2 \to L^2$ operator norm being bound by K_ρ. It is also easily seen that for any $f \in L^2(X)$ one has $\left\langle f, A_\rho^T A_\rho f\right\rangle = \left\langle A_\rho f, A_\rho f\right\rangle \ge 0$, therefore it is a self adjoint and positive operator in $L^2(X)$. Thus, its spectrum lies within the interval $[0, K_\rho]$. For brevity, we introduce the notation $A := K_\rho^{-1}A_\rho^T A_\rho$ for the re-normalized composite folding operator.

Let us observe that the iterative formula Eq.(7) may also be written in the series expansion form $f_N = \sum_{n=0}^{N}(I-A)^n f_0$ where we have that $f_0 = Af$, f being the unknown pdf. This form is particularly useful because then we see by induction that $\sum_{n=0}^{N}(I-A)^n A = I - (I-A)^{N+1}$, i.e. we have the explicit formula $f - f_N = (I-A)^{N+1}f$ for the residual term.

By the observed properties of A it is quite evident that $\mathrm{Sp}(A) \subset [0,1]$. Thus, there exists a unique projection valued measure P on the Borel sets of $[0,1]$ such that

$$A = \int_{\lambda\in[0,1]}\lambda\,\mathrm{d}P(\lambda) \tag{14}$$

in the weak sense. This implies that for any $h \in L^2(X)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle h, f - f_N\right\rangle &= \int_{\lambda\in[0,1]}(1-\lambda)^{N+1}\,\mathrm{d}\left\langle h, P(\lambda)f\right\rangle \\ &= \int_{\lambda\in\{0\}}(1-\lambda)^{N+1}\,\mathrm{d}\left\langle h, P(\lambda)f\right\rangle + \\ &\quad \int_{\lambda\in]0,1]}(1-\lambda)^{N+1}\,\mathrm{d}\left\langle h, P(\lambda)f\right\rangle.\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Since $\int_{\lambda\in\{0\}}(1-\lambda)^{N+1}\,\mathrm{d}P(\lambda)=\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}$ for all $N\in\mathbb{N}_0$, we arrive at the identity

$$\left\langle h, f-\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f-f_N\right\rangle=\int_{\lambda\in]0,1]}(1-\lambda)^{N+1}\,\mathrm{d}\left\langle h,P(\lambda)f\right\rangle, \tag{16}$$

and by the monotonity of integration

$$\left|\left\langle h, f-\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f-f_N\right\rangle\right|\leq\int_{\lambda\in]0,1]}|1-\lambda|^{N+1}\,\mathrm{d}\left|\langle h,P(\lambda)f\rangle\right| \tag{17}$$

also holds, where the symbol $|\cdot|$ when applied to complex valued measures denotes variation, which is analoguous to absolute value of complex valued functions. The measure $\langle h,P(\cdot)f\rangle$ on $[0,1]$ has finite variation and the function sequence $\lambda\mapsto(1-\lambda)^{N+1}$ $(N\in\mathbb{N}_0)$ is bounded independently of N and converges pointwise to zero on $]0,1]$, therefore by Lebesgue's theorem of dominated convergence [8, 9] we have that the sequence of integrals converges to zero. Thus, the first part of the theorem is proved by setting $h:=\frac{1}{\mathrm{Volume}(U)}\,\chi_U$.

The second part of the theorem is proved by observing that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|f-\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f-f_N\right\|_{L^2}^2&=\left\langle f,\left((I-A)^{N+1}-\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}\right)^2 f\right\rangle\\&=\int_{\lambda\in]0,1]}(1-\lambda)^{2N+2}\,\mathrm{d}\left\langle f,P(\lambda)f\right\rangle\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where $\langle f,P(\cdot)f\rangle$ is a non-negative valued finite measure and the integrand which is also non-negative, has a bound independent of N, furthermore it monotonically decreases at each point to zero with increasing N. Therefore, by Lebesgue's theorem of dominated convergence and by the monotonity of integration we have that the pertinent expression converges to zero with increasing N in a monotonically decreasing way. ■

Remark 8. *The following remarks clarify the meaning of Theorem 7. in the context of a probability theory setting.*

(i) For any folding operator A_ρ the response function may be conditioned to have the regularity condition $\forall x\in X:\ \rho(\cdot|x)\in L^2(X)$ by convolving it with a square-integrable pdf η whose Fourier transform is nowhere vanishing. Namely, one can solve the modified problem $\eta\star g=A_{\eta\star\rho}f$ for f instead of the original form $g=A_\rho f$. In that way, the transpose folding operator can always be made well-defined. When such a treatment is applied, the iteration modifies as

$$\begin{aligned}K_{\eta\star\rho}&:=\sup_{x\in X}\int\int(\eta\star\rho)(y|z)\,(\eta\star\rho)(y|x)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}z,\\f_0&:=K_{\eta\star\rho}^{-1}A_{\eta\star\rho}^T\,\eta\star g,\\f_{N+1}&:=f_N+\left(f_0-K_{\eta\star\rho}^{-1}A_{\eta\star\rho}^TA_{\eta\star\rho}f_N\right)\\&\quad(N\in\mathbb{N}_0).\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

with the very same convergence properties as in the previous theorem.

(ii) The regularity condition $K_\rho<\infty$ (or $K_{\eta\star\rho}<\infty$) holds for a quite large class of response functions in a probability theory context. Namely, it is easy to check that if A_ρ is a convolution, then $K_\rho=1$. For other practical cases, this condition may be checked numerically as done in [1]. It is shown e.g. that for the response function of particle energy measurement with a typical calorimeter device, one has $K_\rho\approx 1.4$. Also the response function of particle momentum measurement using bending in magnetic field has the pertinent regularity property.

(iii) The regularity condition for the unknown pdf f, i.e. that it has to be square-integrable, holds for a quite generic class of pdfs. This is automatic for instance for any pdf which is known to be essentially bounded.

(iv) When the convergence condition is satisfied, it is seen that if A_ρ is one-to-one, the approximating functions $(f_N)_{N\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ converge to the original unknown pdf f. When A_ρ is not one-to-one, then $(f_N)_{N\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ converge to the closest possible function $f - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f$.

(v) The meaning of convergence result (i) in the context of probability theory is that the approximating functions $(f_N)_{N\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ converge in the sense that the probability of each compact set $U \subset X$ is restored to the maximum possible extent, but the rate of convergence might be different for different sets. When the pdfs are measured or modeled by histograms, as usual in statistical data processing, this means binwise convergence of the restored histograms, the convergence rate being possibly different for different histogram bins. The more global convergence result (ii) does not have a direct probability theory interpretation, but shall have a role in the estimation of bias error at finite iteration order N.

(vi) Note that whenever our pdfs are modeled by histograming, the operation of histogram binning may also be regarded as part of the folding operator as described in [1], and thus it is wise to include its effect in the folding operator A_ρ. This might be done for instance by modeling the true (unknown) pdf f and its iterative approximates f_N as histograms binned on much wider domain with larger binning density than the measured pdf g. In such approximation the folding operator A_ρ may be thought of as a real matrix which is not square.

3.3. ***Estimation of bias error***

The convergence result means that the residual term (bias error) $f - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f - f_N$ of the approximating sequence defined by Eq.(7) decreases to zero with increased iteration order N in the sense that it decreases to zero when averaged over any compact set, i.e. we have binwise convergence in the language of histograms. However, it would be very useful to quantify the bias error at finite N in order to define some stopping criterion. To achieve this, we need to recall a result from the theory of projection valued measures.

Remark 9. *Let P be a projection valued measure of some separable Hilbert space over the Borel sets of $\mathbb{C}$. Then, whenever α and β are $\mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ measurable functions, while h and f are elements of the Hilbert space, one has*

$$\left|\int_{\lambda\in\mathbb{C}} \alpha(\lambda)\,\beta(\lambda)\,\mathrm{d}\,\langle h, P(\lambda)f\rangle\right| \leq \sqrt{\int_{\lambda\in\mathbb{C}} |\alpha(\lambda)|^2\,\mathrm{d}\,\langle h, P(\lambda)h\rangle}\sqrt{\int_{\lambda\in\mathbb{C}} |\beta(\lambda)|^2\,\mathrm{d}\,\langle f, P(\lambda)f\rangle} \quad (20)$$

and the same inequality also holds when α and β are interchanged [9]. This upper bound is in the analogy of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

The following theorem helps to quantify the bias error at a finite iteration order $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Theorem 10. *(Bias error) Take the iterative solution for the unfolding problem as in Eq.(7) and assume that the convergence conditions of Theorem 7. hold. Then, the distance of an N-th iterate f_N from the closest possible function to the true unfolded pdf f in the average over a compact set $U \subset X$ has the following upper bounds:*

(i) One has

$$\left|\frac{1}{\mathrm{Volume}(U)}\int_{x\in U}\left(f-\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f-f_N\right)(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Volume}(U)}}\left\|f-\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f-f_N\right\|_{L^2}. \tag{21}$$

(ii) Similarly, when $\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)$ *is not projected out:*

$$\left|\frac{1}{\mathrm{Volume}(U)}\int_{x\in U}\left(f-f_N\right)(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Volume}(U)}}\left\|f-f_N\right\|_{L^2}. \tag{22}$$

(iii) In addition,

$$\left|\frac{1}{\mathrm{Volume}(U)}\int_{x\in U}\left(f-\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f-f_N\right)(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \leq \left\|f-\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f\right\|_{L^2}\left\|\xi_U-\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}\xi_U-\xi_{U,N}\right\|_{L^2} \tag{23}$$

is valid, where $\xi_U := \frac{1}{\mathrm{Volume}(U)}\chi_U$ *and* $\xi_{U,N}$ *is the N-th iterative approximation of* ξ_U *in terms of Eq.(7).*

(iv) Similarly, one has

$$\left|\frac{1}{\mathrm{Volume}(U)}\int_{x\in U}\left(f-f_N\right)(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \leq \|f\|_{L^2}\left\|\xi_U-\xi_{U,N}\right\|_{L^2} \tag{24}$$

when $\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)$ *is not projected out.*

Proof These are direct consequence of spectral representation of the operator $A := K_\rho^{-1}A_\rho^T A_\rho$ as in the proof of Theorem 7. from which

$$\left|\left\langle h, f-\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f-f_N\right\rangle\right| = \left|\int_{\lambda\in]0,1]} 1\,(1-\lambda)^{N+1}\,\mathrm{d}\left\langle h,P(\lambda)f\right\rangle\right| \leq \sqrt{\int_{\lambda\in]0,1]}|1|^2\,\mathrm{d}\left\langle h,P(\lambda)h\right\rangle}\sqrt{\int_{\lambda\in]0,1]}|(1-\lambda)^{N+1}|^2\,\mathrm{d}\left\langle f,P(\lambda)f\right\rangle} \tag{25}$$

and

$$\left|\left\langle h, f-\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f-f_N\right\rangle\right| = \left|\int_{\lambda\in]0,1]} 1\,(1-\lambda)^{N+1}\,\mathrm{d}\left\langle h,P(\lambda)f\right\rangle\right| \leq \sqrt{\int_{\lambda\in]0,1]}|1|^2\,\mathrm{d}\left\langle f,P(\lambda)f\right\rangle}\sqrt{\int_{\lambda\in]0,1]}|(1-\lambda)^{N+1}|^2\,\mathrm{d}\left\langle h,P(\lambda)h\right\rangle} \tag{26}$$

follows with arbitrary $h \in L^2(X)$. These may be rewritten as:

$$\left|\left\langle h, f-\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f-f_N\right\rangle\right|$$

$$\leq \left\|h - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}h\right\|_{L^2} \left\|\left((I-A)^{N+1} - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}\right) f\right\|_{L^2} \tag{27}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\left\langle h, f - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f - f_N\right\rangle\right| \\ &\quad\leq \left\|f - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f\right\|_{L^2} \left\|\left((I-A)^{N+1} - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}\right) h\right\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Then by using the fact that $\left((I-A)^{N+1} - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}\right) f = f - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f - f_N$ and $\left((I-A)^{N+1} - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}\right) h = h - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}h - h_N$ where h_N is the iterative approximation of h in terms of Eq.(7), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\left\langle h, f - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f - f_N\right\rangle\right| \\ &\quad\leq \left\|h - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}h\right\|_{L^2} \left\|f - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f - f_N\right\|_{L^2}\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\left\langle h, f - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f - f_N\right\rangle\right| \\ &\quad\leq \left\|f - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f\right\|_{L^2} \left\|h - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}h - h_N\right\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

By using $\left\|h - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}h\right\|_{L^2} \leq \|h\|_{L^2}$ and setting $h := \frac{1}{\mathrm{Volume}(U)}\chi_U$ we have proved (i) and (iii).

Quite obviously, the same argument can be repeated with the projection operator $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}$ excluded from the equations, which proves (ii) and (iv). ■

Remark 11. *The following remarks clarify the usability of Theorem 10..*

(i) By statement (i) and (ii) it is implied that the residual error averaged over a compact set $U \subset X$ scales as $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Volume}(U)}}$. In the language of histograms it means that it scales as one per square root of the histogram bin size.

(ii) The upper bounds (i), (iii) decrease monotonically to zero with increasing N. The upper bounds (ii) and (iv) decrease monotonically to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Volume}(U)}}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f\right\|_{L^2}$ and $\|f\|_{L^2}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}\xi_U\right\|_{L^2}$, respectively. Since $\left\|\xi_U - \xi_{U,N}\right\|_{L^2}$ is fully calculable, upper bound (iv) can be used to test whether the inverse of A_ρ exists, i.e. whether $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)} = 0$ holds, or if not, it may be used to quantify the contribution of the irrecoverable part $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f$.

(iii) Via spectral representation it is easy to see that $\|f_N\|_{L^2}$ converges to $\left\|f - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f\right\|_{L^2}$ in a monotonically increasing way, i.e. may be used to approximate this unknown coefficient from below.

(iv) Again via using spectral representation, one can see that with fixed N and $M > N$, the expressions $\|f_M - f_N\|_{L^2}$ and $\left\|\xi_{U,M} - \xi_{U,N}\right\|_{L^2}$ tend to $\left\|f - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f - f_N\right\|_{L^2}$ and $\left\|\xi_U - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}\xi_U - \xi_{U,N}\right\|_{L^2}$ with increasing M, respectively, in a monotonically increasing way. Therefore, they can be used for approximation of these unknown coefficients from below.

(v) As a consequence, the bias error may be estimated for a fixed iteration order N in the following way. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an iteration index threshold $M_{\varepsilon,N} > N$ such that for all $M > M_{\varepsilon,N}$

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\frac{1}{\mathrm{Volume}(U)}\int_{x\in U}\left(f - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)}f - f_N\right)(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \\ &\quad\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Volume}(U)}}(1+\varepsilon)\|f_M - f_N\|_{L^2}\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

is valid. In addition, a closer, U-dependent estimate may be calculated: for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an iteration index threshold $M_{\varepsilon,U,N} > N$ for which for all $M > M_{\varepsilon,U,N}$ the upper bound

$$\left| \frac{1}{\mathrm{Volume}(U)} \int_{x \in U} \left(f - \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Ker}(A_\rho)} f - f_N \right)(x)\, \mathrm{d}x \right| \leq (1+\varepsilon) \left\| f_M \right\|_{L^2} \left\| \xi_{U,M} - \xi_{U,N} \right\|_{L^2} \tag{32}$$

holds. Alternatively,

$$\left| \frac{1}{\mathrm{Volume}(U)} \int_{x \in U} \left(f - f_N \right)(x)\, \mathrm{d}x \right| \leq (1+\varepsilon) \left\| f_M \right\|_{L^2} \left\| \xi_{U} - \xi_{U,N} \right\|_{L^2} \tag{33}$$

is also valid whenever A_ρ is known to be one-to-one, which expression is slightly cheaper to calculate.

3.4. ***Estimation of statistical error***

Armed with the bias error estimates of Theorem 10. one can construct penalty functions which define optimal stopping criterion of the iteration, and one can quantify the error of the approximation at finite iteration order which decreases with increasing iteration order.

In practice, however, the unfolding problem $g = A_\rho f + e$ may also contain a small statistical error term e whose expectation value is zero, its exact value is unknown, but an estimate to the behavior of the random variable $e(x)$ for each $x \in X$ is available. Normally, the covariance matrix $\mathrm{Cov}(e)$ is known along with the measured pdf g and the known response function ρ. If, for instance, g was a histogram, then $\mathrm{Cov}(e) = \mathrm{Cov}(g)$ will be nothing but the diagonal matrix composed of the histogram bin entries. The question naturally arises: how can one quantify the propagated statistical error of the N-th iterative approximation of f, i.e. of f_N. In the followings we show an exact formula for the case when g is measured as a histogram, i.e. can be regarded as an n-component vector of real probability variables with known covariance.

Remark 12. *The following simple facts in probability theory will aid the argumentation of the statistical error propagation.*

(i) If v is a n-component vector of real probability variables, then its covariance $\mathrm{Cov}(v)$ is an $n \times n$ real symmetric positive matrix. Therefore, for any $m \geq n$ there exists (not necessarily uniquely) a real $n \times m$ matrix $\mathrm{Err}(v)$ such that

$$\mathrm{Cov}(v) = \mathrm{Err}(v)\mathrm{Err}(v)^T \tag{34}$$

holds, the symbol $(\cdot)^T$ denoting matrix transpose. Indeed, because of realness, symmetricity and positivity of $\mathrm{Cov}(v)$ there exists uniquely a real symmetric positive $n \times n$ matrix satisfying Eq.(34), the square-root of $\mathrm{Cov}(v)$, and therefore $\mathrm{Err}(v) = \sqrt{\mathrm{Cov}(v)}$ may be chosen. Then, this may be extended to be $n \times m$ $(m \geq n)$ by zeros without effecting Eq.(34). In some special cases, however, there also exists such $n \times m$ $(m \leq n)$ real matrix $\mathrm{Err}(v)$ such that Eq.(34) still holds.

(ii) If v is an n-component vector of real probability variables and M is a real $m \times n$ matrix, then the standard error propagation formula

$$\mathrm{Cov}(Mv) = M\mathrm{Cov}(v)M^T \tag{35}$$

holds.

(iii) As a consequance of the previous observations, one can express the standard error propagation formula also in the form

$$\mathrm{Err}(Mv) = M\mathrm{Err}(v) \tag{36}$$

where $\mathrm{Err}(v)$ *is any real* $n \times n$ *matrix satisfying Eq.(34), and the resulting real* $m \times n$ *matrix* $\mathrm{Err}(Mv)$ *shall obey* $\mathrm{Err}(Mv)\mathrm{Err}(Mv)^T = \mathrm{Cov}(Mv)$.

(iv) In our unfolding problem the N*-th iterative approximation of* f*, i.e.* f_N*, may be expressed in the form*

$$f_N = \left(\sum_{n=0}^{N} \left(I - K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T A_\rho \right)^n \right) K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T g \tag{37}$$

which is manifestly linear in the measured pdf g*. This fact may be used in order to construct statistical error propagation formula in terms of the previous observations.*

Armed with these equalities, we are ready to state the statistical error propagation formula for our unfolding method.

Theorem 13. *(Statistical error) Take the iterative solution for the unfolding problem as in Eq.(7) and assume that the convergence conditions of Theorem 7. hold. Let* $\mathrm{Cov}(g)$ *be the* $n \times n$ *statistical covariance matrix of the measured pdf* g*, where* g *is given in the form of an* n*-bin histogram. If* f *and* f_N *is modeled as an* m*-bin histogram, then the* $m \times m$ *covariance matrix of* f_N*,* $\mathrm{Cov}(f_N)$*, may be obtained by the following iterative formula along with* f_N*:*

$$\begin{aligned} E_0 &:= K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T \mathrm{Err}(g), \\ E_{N+1} &:= E_N + \left(E_0 - K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T A_\rho E_N \right) \\ &\quad (N \in \mathbb{N}_0) \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where $E_N {E_N}^T = \mathrm{Cov}(f_N)$ *holds for each* N*.*

Proof This is a simple consequence of the linearity of the unfolding method Eq.(7), and of Remark 12. (iv) combined with (iii) and then re-expressing it via iterative form. ■

Remark 14. *The following remarks add some pieces of information about the practical usage of the statistical error propagation theorem.*

(i) If the measured pdf g *is a histogram, then each component obeys Poisson distribution, and thus* $\mathrm{Cov}(g) = \mathrm{diag}(g)$*. Furthermore a real* $n \times n$ *matrix* $\mathrm{Err}(g)$*, satisfying* $\mathrm{Err}(g)\mathrm{Err}(g)^T = \mathrm{Cov}(g)$*, may be constructed by taking the componentwise square-root of* $\mathrm{diag}(v)$*. This can directly be used in calculation of* E_0 *in Theorem 13.*

(ii) If f *is modeled as a histogram with* m *bins then for each iteration order* N *the real matrix* E_N *is of* $m \times n$ *type, i.e.* $\mathrm{Cov}(f_N) = E_N {E_N}^T$ *shall be of* $m \times m$ *type.*

(iii) The square-root of the diagonal elements of the obtained covariance matrix $\mathrm{Cov}(f_N)$ *give the exact statistical errors of* f_N *which then may be used to define an iteration stopping criterion, for instance the sum of the statistical errors may be required to be under a predefined threshold. One should not forget, however, that this unfolding method —just as any other unfolding method— introduces pretty strong correlations and thus the non-diagonal elements of* $\mathrm{Cov}(f_N)$ *also play important role when describing the characteristics of the statistical fluctuations of* f_N*.*

3.5. ***Estimation of systematic error***

It was shown that in case of a statistical unfolding problem of the form $g = A_\rho f + e$ the quantification of the two competing error terms is possible: close upper bound to the convergent bias error term was given, whereas exact error propagation formula to the divergent statistical error term was shown. A combination, such as the sum of these terms, may be considered as penalty function and the iteration may be stopped when the penalty function is minimal, furthermore these terms may be quantified at this optimal iteration order with the shown formulae. In practice, however, one often faces the problem of systematic errors whenever the measured pdf contains some systematic distortion not accounted for in our model of response function, or equivalently, our model of response function is slightly inaccurate. Formally we may write in such case that the actually measured pdf is $g + \delta g = A_{(\rho+\delta\rho)} f + e$ where $\delta\rho$ is the deviation of the true response function $\rho + \delta\rho$ from our model response function ρ. Since by definition $g = A_\rho f + e$ would be the measured pdf in the absence of $\delta\rho$, one arrives at the relation $\delta g = A_{\delta\rho} f$ between δg and $\delta\rho$. When applying the iterative solution Eq.(7) using ρ to the actually measured pdf $g + \delta g$, the N-th iterative estimate of the true unknown pdf f shall contain a propagated contribution δf_N which needs to be quantified. In experimental practice, the systematic error of the actually measured pdf is given in terms of some close upper estimate sg for which $|\delta g| \leq sg$ holds, or similarly as a close upper estimate $s\rho$ for which $|\delta\rho| \leq s\rho$ is valid. Our aim is to provide some upper estimate to $|\delta f_N|$ based on sg or $s\rho$, for any given iteration order $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$. For this, let us introduce the following normalization factors

$$C_{\rho,sg} := \sqrt{\int \left(K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T sg\right)^2 (x)\, \mathrm{d}x} \tag{39}$$

if the systematic errors are known in terms of sg, and

$$D_{\rho,s\rho} := \sqrt{\sup_{x\in X} \int\int \left(K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T s\rho\right)(y|z)\, \left(K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T s\rho\right)(y|x)\, \mathrm{d}y\, \mathrm{d}z} \tag{40}$$

if the systematic errors are known in terms of $s\rho$.

Theorem 15. *(Systematic error) Take the iterative solution for the unfolding problem as in Eq.(7) and assume that the conditions of convergence hold. Then, the following upper bounds are valid on the systematic deviation δf_N of the N-th iterative approximation of f, f_N.*

(i) For the average of δf_N over any compact set $U \subset X$ one has

$$\left| \frac{1}{\mathrm{Volume}(U)} \int_{x\in U} \delta f_N(x)\, \mathrm{d}x \right| \leq \left\| \Xi_{U,N} \right\|_{L^2} C_{\rho,sg} \tag{41}$$

where $\xi_U := \frac{1}{\mathrm{Volume}(U)} \chi_U$ and $\Xi_{U,N}$ is defined by the iteration

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_{U,0} &:= \xi_U\,, \\ \Xi_{U,N+1} &= \Xi_{U,N} + \left(\Xi_{U,0} - K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T A_\rho \Xi_{U,N}\right) \\ &\quad (N \in \mathbb{N}_0). \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

(ii) Alternatively,

$$\left| \frac{1}{\mathrm{Volume}(U)} \int_{x\in U} \delta f_N(x)\, \mathrm{d}x \right| \leq \left\| \Xi_{U,N} \right\|_{L^2} D_{\rho,s\rho} \left\| f \right\|_{L^2}. \tag{43}$$

Proof We begin the proof by recalling that because of Eq.(37) and its modified form

$$f_N + \delta f_N = \left(\sum_{n=0}^{N} \left(I - K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T A_\rho \right)^n \right) K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T (g + \delta g) \tag{44}$$

in presence of systematic distortions, we have that

$$\delta f_N = \left(\sum_{n=0}^{N} \left(I - K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T A_\rho \right)^n \right) K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T \delta g \tag{45}$$

where δg is the unaccounted systematic distortion of the measured pdf, which is related to the unaccounted systematic distortion of the response function $\delta\rho$ by $\delta g = A_{\delta\rho} f$.

Again, we use the notation $A := K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T A_\rho$ and use its spectral representation as in the proof of Theorem 7. With this, one has

$$\langle h, \delta f_N \rangle = \int_{\lambda \in [0,1]} 1 \sum_{n=0}^{N} (1-\lambda)^n \, \mathrm{d} \left\langle h, P(\lambda) K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T \delta g \right\rangle \tag{46}$$

for any $h \in L^2(X)$. From that, using Remark 9. we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} &|\langle h, \delta f_N \rangle| \\ &\quad \leq \sqrt{\int_{\lambda \in [0,1]} \left| \sum_{n=0}^{N} (1-\lambda)^n \right|^2 \mathrm{d} \langle h, P(\lambda) h \rangle} \\ &\qquad \sqrt{\int_{\lambda \in [0,1]} |1|^2 \, \mathrm{d} \left\langle K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T \delta g, P(\lambda) K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T \delta g \right\rangle} \\ &\quad = \left\| \sum_{n=0}^{N} (I - A)^n h \right\|_{L^2} \left\| K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T \delta g \right\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad = \| H_N \|_{L^2} \left\| K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T \delta g \right\|_{L^2} \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

where the notation $H_N := \sum_{n=0}^{N} (I - A)^n h$ was introduced. It is quite evident that H_N may be calculated using the iterative form

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 \quad &:= h, \\ H_{N+1} &:= H_N + (H_0 - A H_N) \\ &\quad (N \in \mathbb{N}_0) \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

in order to evaluate $\| H_N \|_{L^2}$.

An upper bound for $\left\| K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T \delta g \right\|_{L^2}$ may be readily constructed using the inequality

$$\left\| K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T \delta g \right\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \left\| K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T s g \right\|_{L^2}^2 = C_{\rho, sg}^2 \tag{49}$$

which is seen to hold using Fubini's theorem and monotonity of integration, where non-negativity of ρ and sg is tacitly assumed as previously.

Now, by setting $h := \xi_U$, part (i) of the theorem is proved.

Part (ii) may be proved by using the relation $\delta g = A_{\delta\rho} f$ which implies that

$$\left\| K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T \delta g \right\|_{L^2}^2 = \left\| K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T A_{\delta\rho} f \right\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \left\| K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T A_{s\rho} f \right\|_{L^2}^2 \tag{50}$$

again because of Fubini's theorem and monotonity of integration, where one should note that ρ, $s\rho$ and f is assumed to be non-negative as previously. Then, we see that

$$\left\| K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T A_{s\rho} f \right\|_{L^2}^2 = \left\langle f, K_\rho^{-1} A_{s\rho}^T A_\rho K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T A_{s\rho} f \right\rangle$$

$$\leq \|f\|_{L^2}^2 \left\|K_\rho^{-1} A_{s\rho}^T A_\rho K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T A_{s\rho}\right\|_{L^2\to L^2} \qquad (51)$$

holds. Realizing that the L^2 operator norm of the positive self adjoint operator $K_\rho^{-1} A_{s\rho}^T A_\rho K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T A_{s\rho}$ can be bound via Riesz-Thorin theorem similarly as for $K_\rho^{-1} A_\rho^T A_\rho$ in proof of Theorem 7. we conclude that the pertinent operator norm is bound by $D_{\rho,s\rho}^2$, which completes the proof. ■

Remark 16. *The following remarks provide some more explanation about the usability of the above results on upper estimation of the systematic errors of f_N originating from the systematic errors of the measured pdf g or of the response function ρ.*

(i) For any given iteration order $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ the upper estimate (i) of Theorem 15. bounds the systematic deviation of the unfolded pdf f_N averaged over any compact set, in a manifestly calculable way if the systematic errors of the measured pdf are given. In the language of histograms this means that bin-by-bin upper bound to the systematic error of the unfolded pdf is available in terms of the systematic error of the measured pdf.

(ii) The upper estimate (ii) of Theorem 15. provides an alternative bound for the same quantity for the case when the systematic errors are known in terms of the systematic error of the response function. This, similarly to Theorem 10. (iv), needs the unknown value of $\|f\|_{L^2}$ which may be circumvented in the analogy of Remark 11. (v). Namely, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an iteration index threshold $M_\varepsilon \in \mathrm{N}_0$ such that for all $M > M_\varepsilon$ one has

$$\left|\frac{1}{\mathrm{Volume}(U)} \int_{x\in U} \delta f_N(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \leq \left\|\Xi_{U,N}\right\|_{L^2} D_{\rho,s\rho}\,(1+\varepsilon)\,\|f_M\|_{L^2} \qquad (52)$$

whenever A_ρ is one-to-one, because then in the light of Remark 11. (iii), $\|f_M\|_{L^2}$ as a function of M converges to $\|f\|_{L^2}$ in a monotonically increasing way.

4. Generalization to the context of probability measures

In rare cases one faces the problem that the distributions in question cannot be described in terms of pdfs, only in terms of probability measures instead.§ Such practical cases may arise for instance when the folding operator represents kinematics of particle decays [2]. Therefore, it is interesting to ask the question whether the iterative unfolding method Eq.(7) applies in the framework of probability measures.

Remark 17. *Let us recall some notions in measure theory [8, 11].*

(i) A complex measure F over X is a complex valued σ-additive set function on the Borel σ-algebra of the subsets of X. The variation of the complex measure F is the non-negative valued measure $|F|$ defined by the requirement: for a Borel set E the value of $|F|(E)$ is the supremum of $\sum_{k=0}^{K} |F(E_k)|$ for any splitting $E_1, \ldots, E_K$ of E, i.e. for all such finite system of disjoint Borel sets $E_1, \ldots, E_K$ whose union totals up to E. The measures with finite variation, i.e. which have $|F|(X) < \infty$, form a Banach space with the norm being $\|F\| := |F|(X)$. We shall denote this space by $M(X)$.

§ A measure is a set function of the subsets of the probability base space. A common example of measures is the Dirac delta.

(ii) A probability measure F on X is a non-negative measure on the Borel σ-algebra of X with the requirement $F(X) = 1$. Thus, quite naturally, a probability measure on X resides in $M(X)$.

We continue with the formal definition of folding operators whose response function is described by a measure rather than a function.

Definition 18. *A mapping $Q : X \to M(Y), x \mapsto Q(\cdot|x)$ is called folding measure if for every $x \in X$ the measure $Q(\cdot|x)$ is a non-negative measure on Y with $Q(Y|x) = 1$ (i.e. $Q(\cdot|x)$ is a probability measure for all $x \in X$), and for every Borel set E in Y the function $x \mapsto Q(E|x)$ is measurable.*

Remark 19. *A possible usual generalization is when inefficiencies are also allowed, i.e. the less restrictive condition $Q(Y|x) \leq 1$ is required for all $x \in X$. The results throughout this paper also holds for that case.*

It follows from the definition that a folding measure Q may be viewed as a conditional probability measure over the product space $Y \times X$. Quite evidently, if ρ is a response function then $Q_\rho(E|x) := \int_{y \in E} \rho(y|x)\,\mathrm{d}y$ defines a folding measure.

Definition 20. *Let Q be a folding measure. Then, the linear map*

$$A_Q : M(X) \to M(Y),\ F \mapsto \left(\int Q(\cdot|x)\,\mathrm{d}F(x) \right) \tag{53}$$

is called the folding operator by Q.

Remark 21. *The remarks below follow from the definition [2].*

(i) A folding operator A_Q is well-defined as for all points $x \in X$ and Borel sets E of Y the inequality $Q(E|x) \leq 1$ holds, thus the function $x \mapsto Q(E|x)$ is integrable by any measure with finite variation.

(ii) The monotonity of integration implies that a folding operator is continuous and $\|A_Q\|_{M(X)\to M(Y)} = 1$, just as in the case of L^1 theory. If inefficiencies are allowed, $\|A_Q\|_{M(X)\to M(Y)} \leq 1$ holds.

(iii) The folding operators defined by folding measures is a generalization of the folding operators by response functions.

As in the L^1 theory, the convolutions represent an important class of folding operators.

Definition 22. *A folding operator A_Q is called a convolution if its folding measure is translationally invariant in the sense that $Y = X$ and for all $x, z \in X$ and Borel sets E one has $Q(E|x + z) = Q(E - z|x)$.*

Remark 23. *The followings are important properties of convolution operators with measures [2].*

(i) Whenever the folding operator A_Q by a folding measure Q is a convolution, Q may be expressed by a single probability measure $R := Q(\cdot|0)$ in the form of $Q(E|x) = R(E - x)$ for all $x \in X$ and Borel set E. The alternative notation $R \star F := A_Q F$ is often used in such case ($F \in M(X)$). Note that the convolution is commutative, i.e. one has $R \star F = F \star R$ for all $R, F \in M(X)$.

(ii) Fourier transformation of measures in $M(X)$ can also be defined and has similar properties as in the L^1 case, except that the Fourier transform functions do not decay at infinity, i.e. the Riemann-Lebesgue lemma does not hold. Only the boundedness of Fourier transforms are guaranteed.

(iii) Properties of convolution operators are similarly related to the Fourier transform of the underlying probability measure, as in the L^1 theory. For instance, a convolution operator is one-to-one if and only if its Fourier transform is nonzero almost everywhere.

(iv) It is easily seen that if $\varphi \in L^1(X)$ and $F \in M(X)$, then $\varphi \star F$ is a function in $L^1(X)$. Combining this with Remark 5. (ii) we conclude that if $\varphi \in L^p(X) \cap L^1(X)$ then for all $F \in M(X)$ the function $\varphi \star F \in L^p(X) \cap L^1(X)$ $(1 \leq p \leq \infty)$. That is, probability measures may be mapped into pdfs in $L^p(X)$ via convolution by a pdf integrable on the p-th power.

Armed with the introduced notions we may try to ask the question whether one can generalize the results in Section 3 to probability measures.

Remark 24. *The following results are generalization of the results in Section 3 for probability measures.*

(i) The naive application of Neumann series fails to work similarly as in the L^1 framework. This is because as proved in [2] one has $\|I - A_Q\|_{M(X)\to M(X)} = 2$ whenever $Q(\{y\}|y) = 0$ for any point y — which is the generic case.

(ii) The convergence and error propagation results of Theorem 7., 10., 13., 15. may be generalized in a similar manner to Remark 8. (i)-(ii). Namely, instead of the original problem $G = A_Q F$ one may consider the modified version $\eta \star G = A_{\eta\star Q} F$ to be solved for F, where η is a square-integrable pdf whose Fourier transform is nowhere vanishing. In this case, the folding operator A_Q is mapped to be a folding operator by a response function $A_{\eta\star Q}$ instead, as we have $\eta \star A_Q F = A_{\eta\star Q} F$ for any $F \in M(X)$. Furthermore, for each $x \in X$ the pdf $\eta \star Q(\cdot|x)$ is square-integrable. Then, the iteration

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\eta\star Q} &:= \sup_{x\in X} \int\int (\eta \star Q)(y|z)\,(\eta \star Q)(y|x)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}z, \\ F_0 &:= K_{\eta\star Q}^{-1} A_{\eta\star Q}^T\, \eta \star G, \\ F_{N+1} &:= F_N + \left(F_0 - K_{\eta\star Q}^{-1} A_{\eta\star Q}^T A_{\eta\star Q} F_N\right) \\ &\quad (N \in \mathbb{N}_0). \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

obeys the very same convergence and error propagation properties as stated in Theorem 7., 10., 13., 15., whenever $K_{\eta\star Q} < \infty$ and when the unknown probability measure F corresponds to a square-integrable pdf.

The previous observations conclude that whenever the unknown distribution is described by a pdf which is square-integrable, then the folding measure may be conditioned in a way that the iterative unfolding Eq.(7) applies to it.

5. Concluding remarks

In this paper we presented mathematical proofs of convergence and error propagation formulae for a linear iterative unfolding method [1] in a probability theory context. It was shown that the pertinent method is convergent in the 'binwise' sense under quite

generic conditions, which do hold in case of many practical applications. Furthermore, explicit formulae for the three important error terms, the bias error, the statistical error and the systematic errors were derived. These may be used to define optimal iteration stopping criterion and quantification of errors therein. The key element of the proofs is the Riesz-Thorin theorem.

The pertinent method is also available as a C numerical library [12]. The algorithm could be included in the ROOUnfold package [13] in the future.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Tamás Matolcsi for reading the manuscript and for valuable discussions. I also thank Dezső Varga for discussions on the physical applications and on the relevance of error propagation formulae, in particular for the systematic errors. This work was supported by the Momentum ('Lendület') program of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

References

[1] Laszlo A 2012 *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **368** 012043
[2] Laszlo A 2006 *J. Phys.* A **39** 13621
[3] Cowan G 2002 *Proceedings of Conference on Advanced Statistical Techniques in Particle Physics (18-22 March 2002, Durham, United Kingdom)* (IPPP/02/39, Durham) p 248
[4] Blobel V 2008 Unfolding for HEP Experiments (*Talk at DESY Computing Seminar*) `http://www.desy.de/~blobel/DESYcompsem08.pdf`
[5] Arfken G 1985 Convolution theorem 15.5 *Mathematical Methods for Physicists* 3rd edn (Orlando, FL: Academic) pp 810-14
[6] Bracewell P Convolution theorem *The Fourier Transform and Its Applications* 3rd edn (New York: McGraw-Hill) pp 108-12
[7] Landweber L 1951 *Am. J. Math.* **73** 615
[8] Matolcsi T, Gruber T and Keresztfalvi T 1995-1999 *Analízis I-IX* (Lecture notes) (Budapest: Eötvös University)
[9] Rudin W 1973 *Functional Analysis* (New York: McGraw-Hill)
[10] Folland G B 1999 *Real Analysis: Modern Techniques and Their Applications* 2nd edn (Wiley-Interscience)
[11] Dinculeanu N 1967 *Vector Measures* (Elsevier)
[12] László A 2011 The libunfold package (*Source code*) `http://www.rmki.kfki.hu/~laszloa/downloads/libunfold.tar.gz`
[13] Adye T *et al* The ROOUnfold package `http://hepunx.rl.ac.uk/~adye/software/unfold/RooUnfold.html`